



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

sk

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/328,749	06/09/99	GEBHARD	J ADI-005

021323 QM12/1204
TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON MA 02110

EXAMINER

STASHICK, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3728

DATE MAILED:

12/04/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/328,749

Applicant(s)

GEBHARD, JEFFREY E.

Examiner

Anthony D Stashick

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 9-10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coplans 3,550,597. Coplans '597 discloses all the limitations of the claims including the following: a torsion system 15; forefoot portion 17; rear foot portion 16; intermediate portion 18; intermediate portion coupling forefoot and rear foot portion together (see Figures); intermediate portion made of material to allow for rotation of forefoot portion relative to rear foot portion about the longitudinal line of the system (see Figures 4, 6, 12 and 13); forefoot, rear foot, and intermediate portions form a single plate (see Figure 1); the single plate is substantially rigid in a horizontal plane (see column 3, lines 40-42), the width of the intermediate portion is less than that of the rear and forefoot portions (see Figures 11, 2, 4, 12, 13, and 15).

3. Claims 1, 5-11, 15-17, 19-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderie 4,922,631. Anderie '631 discloses all the limitations of the claims including the following: a torsion system (9 in figure 1, or 116, 118, 119 shown in Figure 8 or that shown in Figure 4); a forefoot portion (119 or that where 111 is located in Figure4); rear foot portion (118 or that where 112 is located in Figure 4); intermediate portion (116 of Figure 8 or 110, 114, 115 of Figure 4); intermediate portion coupling together forefoot and rear foot portions (see Figures) and made of a material that allows rotation of the forefoot portion relative to the rear foot portion about the longitudinal line of the torsion system (see Abstract or column 4, lines 29-50); intermediate portion includes a rib (see Figure 6, ribs are 114, 115, and 116 while base is 113); rib tuned torsionability (see

Art Unit: 3728

column 5, lines 62-66); at least one aperture 120 in rear foot portion; rear foot, forefoot and intermediate portions form a single plate (see Figures); the plate is substantially rigid in a horizontal plane (see column 4, lines 39-51); plate is between 1 and 15 mm thick (see column 4, lines 10-15); the width of the intermediate portion is less than that of the rear foot and forefoot portions (see Figures); plate comprises nylon (see column 4, line 7); plate comprises composite material (see Column 4, lines 55-59) including glass; front and rear foot portions comprise different material properties than intermediate portion (see column 4, lines 3-15 and 55-63); aperture formed in intermediate portion (that area between 115 and 166 or 116 and 114 in figure 6); outsole 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderie '631 in view of Nagano et al. 5,446,977. Anderie '631 discloses all the limitations of the claims except for the footwear being a cycle shoe and having a cleat attachment. Nagano et al. teaches that it is desirable to have a torsion system placed within a cycle shoe, with a cleat attachment (8, 9a, 9), to keep the foot located properly on the pedal of a bicycle to allow for the largest driving force possible to be transferred from the user's leg to the pedal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to place the torsion system of Anderie into a bicycle shoe, such as that shown in Nagano et al. '977, to aid in keeping the foot properly located on the pedal to get the most work out of the energy expelled by the rider and to

Art Unit: 3728

help in correcting the twisting of the user's leg due to the pedaling of the bicycle. Nagano et al. '977 also shows the shoe containing an upper as seen in Figures 8-9.

6. Claims 2-4 and 11-14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over any of the references as applied to claims 1 and 9 above. The references as applied to claims 1 and 9 above disclose all the limitations of the claims except for the specific degree of rotation of the forefoot portion to the rear foot portion, the thickness of the intermediate portion or the intermediate portion being made of graphite. It appears that it would have been a mere matter of testing and optimization to find the degree of rotation of the forefoot portion with respect to the rear foot portion that would best aid the foot to rotate the desired amount to counter the rotation of the foot due to knee movement. It also appears that it would have been a mere matter of testing and optimization to find the thickness and material makeup (as the material make up of the intermediate also is a factor in determining the necessary thickness needed) of the intermediate portion that would allow the desired rotation and to customized the torsion system to different people's feet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to find the proper angle of rotation of the forefoot portion to the rear foot portion and the thickness and material of the intermediate portion that would best compensate for the twisting motion performed by the knee on the foot.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed September 25, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the invention in Coplans does not show all the limitations as claimed in the instant application and this argument is not clearly understood. Applicant's argument is that the Coplans is relatively small and covers less than half of the forefoot area. This argument is unclear. Although Coplans may cover less than half of the forefoot area, it still covers "substantially an entire fore foot area" or "substantially an entire rearfoot area" when that area is defined as a portion in the

Art Unit: 3728

front or rear of the shoe. There appears to be no limitation in the claims that require the forefoot area to cover the entire forefoot area of the shoe sole as it appears applicant is trying to argue. This same argument holds true for Anderie as well. With respect to applicant's argument that the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations, argument is not clearly understood. The motivation to combine references can come from the prior art itself, what the prior art teaches, or from the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. In the instant application, Nagano was used to teach that the torsion system (plate 6, acting as a torsion plate as it allows twisting of the front of the plate with respect to the rear of the plate) can be placed in a bicycle shoe and can have a cleat attachment 8, 9, 9a located with it, thereby teaching a torsion plate with a cleat attachment used within a bicycling shoe.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony D Stashick whose telephone number is 703-308-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday from 8:30 am until 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 3728

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul T. Sewell can be reached on 703-308-2126. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3579 for regular communications and 703-305-3579 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

ADS
December 1, 2000


DAVID T. FIDEI
PRIMARY EXAMINER